

## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 33-41. Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Drawings

The Examiner is requiring that Figure 15 be labeled -- prior art -- . Applicants have done so herein and are requesting that this objection be withdrawn.

### Specification

The Examiner is also requesting that a new title be submitted. Applicants are amending the title as follows:

Display Device ~~And Method of Manufacturing The Same~~

It is respectfully submitted that this indicates the invention of the claims, and it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner also rejects Claims 67-71 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended each of these claims to remove the objected to phrase. Accordingly, it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner further rejects Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 67 and 68 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Ohtani. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 2 to recite “a second insulating film formed over a periphery of the first substrate and surrounding the pixel portion.” These claims are directed to the structure of, for example, Figs. 1 and 6 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ohtani does not disclose or suggest the second insulating film surrounding the pixel portion. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also has a number of rejections under 35 USC §103(a), each of which are traversed, as explained below:

##### Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 17 and 18

The Examiner rejects Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 17 and 18 as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim and is patentable over the cited reference for at least reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al. in view of Fukunaga et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim and is patentable over the cited references for at least reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 13-16

Claims 13-16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al. in view of Yudasaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim and is patentable over the cited references for at least reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 19 and 69

Claims 19 and 69 are rejected as being unpatentable over Fukunaga et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 19 to recite “a second insulating film provided in a convex manner on an upper face of the first insulating film and in contact with a portion of the first insulating film.” These claims are directed to the structure of, for example, Figs. 4 and 7 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Fukunaga does not disclose or suggest such a structure. Instead, it appears that in Fukunaga the second insulating film 215 is not in contact with a portion of the first insulating film 208. Hence, this reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 20-27, 30-32 and 70

Claims 20-27, 30-32 and 70 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al and further in view of Fukunaga et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 to recite “a second insulating film formed over a periphery of the first substrate and surrounding the pixel portion” and “a third insulating film provided in a convex manner on an upper face of the first insulating film and in contact with a portion of the first insulating film.” These claims are directed to the structure of, for example, Figs. 4 and 7 of the present application.

As explained above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest these features.

Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 28 and 29

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al. and Fukunaga et al. and further in view of Yudasaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim and is patentable over the cited references for at least reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the §103 rejections have been overcome.

#### New Claims

Applicants are adding new Claims 72-81 herewith. It is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 72 is allowable for reasons similar to that of independent Claim 1.

Please charge our deposit account 501/039 for any fee due for these new claims.

#### Conclusion


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance, and it is requested that it now be allowed.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039 for any fee due for this response.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 24, 2004

  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500




Fig. 15  
*PRIOR ART*